



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,329	03/05/2002	Alan A. Winder	41482/205543	9927

30559 7590 01/31/2005

CHIEF PATENT COUNSEL
SMITH & NEPHEW, INC.
1450 BROOKS ROAD
MEMPHIS, TN 38116

EXAMINER

SMITH, RUTH S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3737

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/980,329

Applicant(s)

WINDER ET AL.

Examiner

Ruth S Smith

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 11,15-19,23,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger in view of Talish et al ('162). Unger discloses a method for treating a patient comprising introducing an ultrasound contrast agent into a patient, impinging ultrasound waves in proximity to the treatment area, wherein the ultrasound contrast agent facilitates in lowering the cavitation threshold (see column 10, lines 42-45). The intensity of the ultrasound is maintained in the range as set forth in claim 2 (see column 10, lines 46-48). The contrast agent is comprised of microbubbles having a radius in the range set forth in claims 3,21 (see column 15, lines 17-19). Unger discloses that any type of ultrasound transducer can be used to provide the ultrasound waves. The ultrasound can be provided simultaneously with the MRI. Unger fails to specifically disclose the structure of the ultrasound device for applying the therapeutic ultrasound and fails to specifically disclose mounting the ultrasound source to the body. Talish et al disclose an apparatus for applying therapeutic ultrasound to treat areas in a

patient. The structure disclosed by Talish includes all the ultrasound elements as set forth in the claims. The ultrasound source is mounted to the patient's body. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified Unger such that the therapeutic ultrasound source is mounted to the body to enable simultaneous MRI operation to be more easily performed. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified Unger such that the device used to provide the ultrasound is as taught by Talish et al. The modification merely involves the selection of one of many known types of therapeutic ultrasound assemblies.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger in view of Talish et al as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Unger et al. Unger et al disclose a delivery system for delivering a material into a patient via microbubbles. The microtubules can be intravenously introduced into the patient using a syringe. Furthermore, the material in the microbubbles is released via the application of energy over time and is therefore considered to be time-released forms of application. In the absence of any showing of criticality, the manner in which the contrast agent is introduced into the patient would have been a matter of design choice of known equivalents in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have further modified Unger such that the microbubbles are introduced via an IV using a syringe in a time released manner as disclosed by Unger et al. Such a modification merely involves the selection of a well known means for introduction of a material into a patient.

Claims 1-6, 11,15-21,23,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duarte et al (5,904,659) in view of Vago and Unger. Duarte et al disclose a method of accelerating a healing process using ultrasound. The method involves mounting an ultrasonic source to the patient and impinging ultrasonic waves in proximity to the treatment area where healing is to occur. The SATA set forth in column 4 resides in the range set forth in claim 2. Vago discloses using ultrasound to promote wound healing. Vago discloses that the ultrasound produces stable cavitation to

promote healing. Therefore, it appears that Duarte et al inherently involves the production of cavitation. Unger discloses a method for treating a patient comprising introducing an ultrasound contrast agent into a patient, impinging ultrasound waves in proximity to the treatment area, wherein the ultrasound contrast agent facilitates in lowering the cavitation threshold (see column 10, lines 42-45). The intensity of the ultrasound is maintained in the range as set forth in claim 2 (see column 10, lines 46-48). The contrast agent is comprised of microbubbles having a radius in the range set forth in claims 3,21 (see column 15, lines 17-19). With regard to claim 4, resonant bubble frequency as set forth is inherent in the operating parameters of the system and the microbubbles used. Unger discloses that any type of ultrasound transducer can be used to provide the ultrasound waves. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified Duarte et al such that the ultrasound produces cavitation which promotes wound healing as disclosed by Vago and to have used a contrast agent in order to lower the cavitation threshold as disclosed by Unger in order to prevent harming the patient. With regard to claim 5, Duarte et al disclose a carrier frequency and intensity selected by taking into account various factors. In the absence of any showing of unexpected results, the frequency of the ultrasonic waves could be determined by one skilled in the art without undue experimentation based upon the factors set forth by Duarte et al in column 4. With regard to claim 6, Unger fails to specifically disclose the treatment time set forth. Unger discloses that the ultrasound can be applied until the desired effect is achieved. In the absence of any showing of criticality, the specific time that the treatment lasts would have been obvious to one skilled in the art and could be determined without undue experimentation as the time it takes for the desired effect to be achieved. The kit is inherent in the use of the method.

Claims 7-10,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duarte et al in view of Vago and Unger as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Unger et al. Unger does not specifically disclose the manner in which the contrast agent is introduced into the patient. Unger et al disclose a delivery system for delivering a material into a patient via microbubbles. The microtubules can be intravenously

introduced into the patient using a syringe. Furthermore, the material in the microbubbles is released via the application of energy over time and is therefore considered to be time-released forms of application. In the absence of any showing of criticality, the manner in which the contrast agent is introduced into the patient would have been a matter of design choice of known equivalents in the art such as those disclosed by Unger et al.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duarte et al in view of Vago and Unger as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Unger et al. Unger et al disclose a delivery system for delivering a material into a patient via microbubbles. The microtubules can be intravenously introduced into the patient using a syringe. Furthermore, the material in the microbubbles is released via the application of energy over time and is therefore considered to be time-released forms of application. In the absence of any showing of criticality, the manner in which the contrast agent is introduced into the patient would have been a matter of design choice of known equivalents in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have further modified Unger such that the microbubbles are introduced via an IV using a syringe in a time released manner as disclosed by Unger et al. Such a modification merely involves the selection of a well known means for introduction of a material into a patient.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. . It should be noted that the kit set forth in claims 11-19, 23,24 is not limited by an application directed to healing. The body of the claim fails to set forth any structural limitations directed to healing of wounds. The contrast agent would be capable of performing the function as set forth. With regard to the method claims, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA

1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The use of a contrast agent to lower the cavitation threshold as disclosed by Unger would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of any type of ultrasound therapy in order to prevent harming the patient.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth S Smith whose telephone number is (571) 272-4745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM- 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ruth S. Smith', with a stylized, cursive script.

Ruth S Smith
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3737

RSS